IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA MONROE DIVISION

CHAMBLESS ENTERPRISES LLC; and APARTMENT ASSOCIATION OF LOUISIANA, INC.,

Case No. 3:20-cv-01455-TAD-KLH

Plaintiffs,

JUDGE TERRY A. DOUGHTY

v.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE KAREN L. HAYES

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION; ROBERT R. REDFIELD, in his official capacity as Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; NINA B. WITKOFSKY, in her official capacity as Acting Chief of Staff, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; ALEX AZAR, in his official capacity as Secretary of Health and Human Services; DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; WILLIAM P. BARR, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States,

Defendants.

PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE EXCESS PAGES IN THEIR REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.8, Plaintiffs file this unopposed motion for a page length extension for their reply in support of their motion for preliminary injunction, due on December 14, 2020. Plaintiffs have consulted with opposing counsel and submit that there is good cause for a page length extension, given the complexity of the issues presented. In support of this motion, Plaintiffs state:

- 1. Under Rule 7.8, Plaintiffs are limited to 10 pages for their reply. Plaintiffs request that the court allow a filing not to exceed 20 pages.
- 2. It is unlikely that Plaintiffs can adequately brief these important issues if limited to only 10 pages. Therefore, an extension would serve the interest of justice by enabling the Plaintiffs to fully address the legal issues and to adequately show Plaintiffs' likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, the balance of equities, and the public interest factors required for a preliminary injunction. An extension to allow a reply of no longer than 20 pages would further the interest of justice and would be beneficial to the Court in resolving the preliminary injunction motion.
- 3. Plaintiffs' counsel has consulted with Defendants' counsel and they have indicated they consent to this extension. Plaintiffs likewise consented to Defendants' recent motion to file an overlength opposition.
 - 4. Plaintiffs' proposed overlength reply is attached to this motion.

In light of these facts, Plaintiffs respectfully request an extension allowing a reply brief of no more than 20 pages.

DATED: December 14, 2020.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ STEVEN M. SIMPSON
STEVEN M. SIMPSON*
DC Bar No. 462553
Pacific Legal Foundation
3100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 610
Arlington, VA 22201
Tel: (202) 888-6881
SSimpson@pacificlegal.org

/s/ JAMES C. RATHER, JR.
JAMES C. RATHER, JR.
Louisiana Bar No. 25839
ALKER & RATHER, LLC
4030 Lonesome Rd., Suite B
Mandeville, LA 70448
Tel: (985) 727-7501
JRather@alker-rather.com

LUKE A. WAKE*
DC Bar No. 1009181
ETHAN W. BLEVINS*
Washington State Bar No. 48219
HANNAH SELLS MARCLEY*
Washington State Bar No. 52692
Pacific Legal Foundation
930 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel: (916) 419-7111
Fax: (916) 419-7747
LWake@pacificlegal.org
EBlevins@pacificlegal.org
HMarcley@pacificlegal.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

^{*}Pro hac vice

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 14, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court via the CM/ECF system, which will cause a copy to be served upon counsel of record.

By <u>/s/ STEVEN M. SIMPSON</u>
STEVEN M. SIMPSON